

PATENT APPLICATION
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q65858

Akiyoshi KABE

Allowed: March 8, 2007

Appln. No.: 09/936,160

Group Art Unit: 2192

Confirmation No.: 9208

Examiner: James D. RUTTEN

Filed: November 24, 2000

For: PROGRAMMING DEVICE AND PROGRAMMING METHOD

COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant makes the following comments on the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The Examiner's statement should not be misinterpreted as meaning that the identified features are the only patentable features in any of the claims. The independent claims and the dependent claims include various aspects which provide a separate basis for patentability. The Examiner's statement emphasizes certain aspects of the claims, but each claim should be interpreted using its own precise language, without inferring any particular emphasis from the Examiner's statement.

The claims are carefully written to precisely define the bounds of the invention, and persons reading these remarks hereafter should note that any difference between the Examiner's language (including the Examiner's reference to the specification, which only shows exemplary embodiments)

COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE
U.S. Application No. 09/936,160
Attorney Docket No. Q65858

and the language of the claims should be resolved by recourse to only the express language of the claims.

Patent Office personnel are requested to note that the present submission does not adversely affect the patent term adjustment accrued by Applicant to date. As emphasized in the "Clarification of 37 C.F.R. §1.704(c)(10) – Reduction of Patent Term Adjustment for Certain Types of Papers Filed After a Notice of Allowance Has Been Mailed," 1247OG111 (6/26/01), "a response to the examiner's reasons for allowance" is an example of a paper that does "not cause substantial interference and delay in the patent issue process" and is "not considered a 'failure to engage in reasonable efforts' to conclude processing or examination of the application." Therefore, the Applicant remains entitled to the full patent term adjustment set forth on page 3 of the Notice of Allowance mailed March 8, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nataliya Dvorson/
Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 8, 2007

Attorney Docket No.: Q65858